

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-7 are pending in the application. Claims 4, 6, and 7 have been withdrawn from examination by the Examiner.

The applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority document(s), and for notifying the applicant that the drawings are acceptable.

Claims are amended for non-statutory reasons: to correct one or more informalities, remove figure label number(s), and/or to replace European-style claim phraseology with American-style claim language. The claims are not narrowed in intended scope and no new matter is added.

The Office action objects to claim 3. The applicant respectfully disagrees with this objection. The Office action states that the term 'behind' must be replaced by the term 'after', with reference to the location of the claimed filtering element. The applicant notes that in the field of optics, absent statements to the contrary, directions are relative to the direction of the path of light; as such, "behind" is equivalent to "after". Additionally, the specification refers to the filter being behind the referenced projection lens, and an introduction of a new term in the claims is inconsistent with U.S. patent practice. In the interest of advancing prosecution in this case, however, claim 3 is amended to recite that 'behind' is relative to the light path; no new matter is added, and the scope of claim 3 is unchanged.

The Office action rejects claims 1-3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Moench et al. (USP 6,631,996, hereinafter Moench) and Sakata et al. (USPA 2003/0011751, hereinafter Sakata). The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Neither Moench, nor Sakata, nor the combination of Moench and Sakata teaches a scrolling color projection system that includes a color scanner for generating a light beam from a lamp flux with a plurality of scrolling color fields, and a filtering element that is arranged in the light path between a lamp and the projected

image that is synchronized with the lamp current so as to cancel an intensity peak in the lamp flux.

Moench teaches a conventional color scanner that generates a light beam with a plurality of scrolling color fields. Sakata teaches a color combiner that combines a plurality of color fields before they are scrolled on a display. The combination of Moench and Sakata does not teach the introduction of a filtering element that is synchronized with the driving lamp current so as to cancel the intensity peak in the lamp flux.

The Office action asserts that Moench teaches a filtering element and does not teach a color scanner for generating a light beam with a plurality of scrolling color fields. The applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion. Moench's disk 14 is part of a color scanner, and is not a filter that is arranged so as to cancel intensity peaks in the lamp flux, as specifically claimed by the applicant.

Moench's rotating disk 14 includes a red, blue, green, and white segment; as the disk 14 is rotated, bands of red, blue, green, and white light are produced. Contrary to the Office action's assertion that Moench teaches a filtering element that is arranged to cancel an intensity peak in the lamp flux, Moench specifically teaches that:

"the current strength reaches a maximum when a given segment of the color disk, and preferably exclusively this segment, is present in the radiation path of the light rays used for the projection" (Moench's Abstract, last sentence).

That is, Moench specifically teaches applying peak intensities as each color is displayed, which is contrary to the applicant's claimed use of a filter to cancel such peak intensities.

Sakata teaches a combiner 14 that receives a plurality of color fields and provides a single light beam that is subsequently projected to a display 18 via scanning mirrors 16 and 18. Sakata does not address a light source, does not address varying intensities of lamp flux, and does not address a filter that is arranged to cancel intensity peaks in the lamp flux.

Because neither Moench nor Sakata, nor a combination of Moench and Sakata, teaches or suggests a filter that is configured to cancel flux intensity peaks, and because Moench inherently teaches against the suppression of flux intensity peaks, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 1-3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Moench and Sakata is unfounded, and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. McDermott/
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.
Reg. 41,508
804-493-0707

Please direct all correspondence to:
Corporate Counsel
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001